Historical Papers
Communications historiques

Turning the Spit: Timothy Anglin and the Roasting of D'Arcy McGee

W. M. Baker

Volume 9, numéro 1, 1974

Toronto 1974

URI : https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/030780ar
DOI : https://doi.org/10.7202/030780ar

Aller au sommaire du numéro

Éditeur(s)

The Canadian Historical Association/La Société historique du Canada

ISSN

0068-8878 (imprimé)
1712-9109 (numérique)

Découvrir la revue

Citer cet article

Baker, W. M. (1974). Turning the Spit: Timothy Anglin and the Roasting of D'Arcy McGee. *Historical Papers / Communications historiques*, *9*(1), 135–155. https://doi.org/10.7202/030780ar

W. M. BAKER
UNIVERSITY OF LETHBRIDGE

Turning the Spit: Timothy Anglin and the Roasting of D'Arcy McGee.

Timothy Warren Anglin[1] would have been most displeased with the title of this paper. During his lifetime he maintained that it was beneath his dignity to attack Thomas D'Arcy McGee[2]; that McGee was "one of those whom his worst enemy need not take the trouble to slander, and as we have no desire to give colour to the old calumny 'Put one Irishman on the Spit and you will get another to turn it', we will leave the task of exposing his real character, as far as it may be yet unknown, to time . . ."[3] Anglin would not have denied, however, that his debate with McGee between 1863 and 1868 said a good deal about the nature, status, character and style of the Irish Catholic community and its leaders during the Confederation era.

In attempting to account for the development of antagonism between Anglin and McGee one might wonder if character differences or disagreements in political philosophies played significant roles. Undoubtedly Anglin's more placid temperament and his greater sympathy for such important nineteenth century concepts as liberalism and democracy contributed to his conflict with McGee.[4] Differences in personality and political philosophy were counteracted, however, by marked similarities in birthplace, education, social status and profession.[5] Both men had their disagreements with clergymen, but still, Christian morality and the Catholic religion were at the core of the life philosophy and political ideology of both.[6] In short, neither ideology nor character traits were more than contributing factors to the outbreak of hostilities between the men. Circumstances played the most important role.

In fact, until the summer of 1863 Anglin's relations with McGee, though not particularly close, were reasonably harmonious.[7] Such accord disappeared in the aftermath of an occasion which seemed innocent enough on the surface – McGee's lengthy lecture at the Saint John Mechanics Institute on July 28, 1863, entitled "The Inter-Colonial Railway in Relation to the Future of British America".[8] While Anglin and other dignitaries sat on the platform, McGee expressed his support and enthusiasm for the proposed railroad. But in justifying the Intercolonial Railway McGee delved into the subjects of defence and commercial relations. This discussion naturally led him to voice his glorious vision of a united British North America, a

constitutional monarchy, a country which would avoid the fatal defects of the American republican system. He advocated union to increase immigration, to obtain greater military security against the American menace, to "give us nationality", and "to fix forever the monarchical character of our institutions". The latter was extremely important to McGee because he considered the great republican experiment in the United States a virtual, if magnificent, failure.[9] To bring his argument back to its starting point, McGee claimed that the building of the Intercolonial Railroad was essential to the whole plan of union: "the railroad will give us Union, Union will give us nationality, and nationality a Prince of the blood of our ancient kings".

Anglin's response was in part pre-conditioned by the fact that McGee had sided with Anglin's political enemies on the Intercolonial Railway question.[10] In fact, throughout the 1863 session of the New Brunswick Assembly Anglin had fought Samuel Leonard Tilley's Government on this issue because he believed that westward extension of the Shediac to Saint John railroad should take precedence over an Intercolonial line, the route and economic viability of which were questionable.[11] It was natural, therefore, that Anglin would dispute McGee's views on the Intercolonial Railway, and as McGee had chosen to relate the railroad to much larger questions Anglin felt compelled to discuss the other issues as well. And so, for three weeks following McGee's speech, Anglin's newspaper, the *Freeman,* contained long and detailed commentary on many aspects of the lecture.

Anglin began by questioning McGee's argument on political systems. Was republicanism, the *Freeman* queried, to blame for the economic and social problems which had led to the Civil War? Could monarchy have dealt more effectively with slavery in the South or "fierce bitter intolerant fanaticism" in the North? [12] Anglin thought not. The failure, he argued, was not caused by a particular constitutional system but rather by "a want of religious training or religious feeling . . "[13] Thus for Anglin, stamping monarchical institutions on British North America was not very important.

> What is this British Constitution of which we boast? . . . it would be as worthless as any other form of Government, definite or indefinite, if the spirit of freedom and order and good government did not pervade the people as a whole . . .[14]

When Anglin turned to an analysis of the subject of British North American Union, he again found himself in disagreement with the Irish Canadian visitor. Union was a dream for the future, Anglin thought, not a matter of current practical politics. Thus he had little patience with those for whom "no flight of fancy is too wild, no exaggeration of facts too gross, no

hyperbole too absurd", when speaking about a union of the provinces. "If you could believe these men", Anglin stated in mocking tones, "the mere act of union would give us military and naval strength, would bring us a population, would develop our resources, bring mines and minerals to light, secure to us the trade of the Great West, and direct through the magnificent valleys of the St. John, the St. Lawrence, &c., &c., the tide of travel from Europe to Asia".[15] As far as Anglin was concerned such suggestions were absurd. Moreover, he argued, how could a real union be forged out of the disparate, detached colonies of British North America? This was not only a stumbling block to union, but also was something that could not be removed by union.

> . . . no Federal or Legislative Union can bring the people who inhabit these vast countries more closely together, or fill up the great wilderness intervals with a new population . . It would not bring us more people and more capital, and population and capital are what we want most.[16]

Union would not bring greater immigration because it could not remove the impression that the United States was the best place to go to gain an honest independence. Union would confer no benefits on New Brunswick's farmers or fishermen; Canadians would remain their great rival. Anglin feared that New Brunswick's already neglected roads, bridges and harbours would fall into a worse state "when we had to petition that great Assembly for our own money".[17] What good would union be for the defence of British North America? Very little, Anglin thought. True it was that the United States was "no longer a peaceable, non-aggressive country", but British North American Union was hardly an effective means of meeting the threat.[18] In the first place, Anglin asserted, union must be a large if not complete step towards independence from Britain.[19] Total independence would mean that the provinces might escape invasion in an Anglo-American war, but it would also mean that Britain would lend no aid if the provincials quarrelled with the United States. The result of such a dispute seemed obvious. In Anglin's opinion, union could not provide more manpower, could not enable the provinces to resist attack better than the existing system, and could not even assist the provinces to co-operate more effectively with British military forces.[20] Finally, Anglin had little sympathy with those who argued that union was needed to enlarge the scope for public men.[21] On the contrary, the *Freeman* proclaimed:

> The true work of the real statesmen in these Provinces to-day is not to indulge in wild visions or to weight down the energies of the people by imposing on them burdens far beyond their power that he may carry out some extravagant scheme, but to labour patiently, prudently, removing, when possible, all difficulties in the way of the merchant and manufacturer,

> increasing all the facilities for opening up new districts for settlement, and new fields for enterprise, building new bye [sic] roads and great roads and Railroads wherever they are required, as fast as the means of the people will permit, indulging in no chimeras and fancies at the public expense, and not making the gratification of his own vanity, and avarice the chief object of his ambition.[22]

Many then and now would find fault with Anglin's assessment of political systems and prevailing circumstances. But few would deny the plausibility and effectiveness of his arguments. Certainly McGee must have become aware that Anglin would not accept any 'intrusion' into the politics of New Brunswick without a thorough rebuttal. The debate of the summer of 1863, however, was gentlemanly and quite elevated even though Anglin couldn't refrain from mocking McGee's "flight of fancy." Nevertheless, the two Irish leaders had now clashed publicly: McGee suggesting indirectly that Anglin's opposition to the Intercolonial Railway was selfish and short-sighted; Anglin indicating that McGee was a visionary ideologue who couldn't come down from the clouds long enough to deal with concrete reality. The fact that British North American Union became a subject of practical politics the following summer meant that the breach opened between the two men could not be healed by the passage of time.

A detailed analysis of McGee's promotion of and Anglin's opposition to Confederation cannot be presented here. McGee continued his efforts on behalf of union in numerous speeches and pamphlets and by participation in the Charlottetown and Quebec Conferences. Anglin clung to his belief that union was premature and proffered no significant advantages to New Brunswick. Added to his 1863 criticism of the union idea in general was a specific condemnation of the Quebec Resolutions of 1864. He considered that the financial arrangements were unacceptable; that New Brunswick could not adequately defend its distinct interests under a system of representation by population; that the scheme really called for a legislative rather than a federal union; and that the decision of the delegates to Quebec not to submit the Resolutions to the electorate was mockery of responsible government. Anglin's arguments helped to carry the day for the New Brunswick anti-Confederates in March, 1865, after the Tilley Government had found it necessary to hold an election, and he became a minister without portfolio in the new cabinet. In the aftermath of the New Brunswick election, however, McGee began to promote a 'disloyalty' argument. He considered the contest to have been "a fair stand-up fight of Yankee interests on the one side and British interests on the other".[23] Before the year was out McGee was asserting that anyone who opposed Confederation was an annexationist, or at least so the *Freeman* charged.[24] Although McGee was far from the only one

to raise this loyalty issue, it certainly did not promote Anglin's compassion when the shoe was on the other foot.

Anglin's opportunity came in the summer of 1865 when McGee made two important speeches during a visit across the Atlantic. His address at Wexford was plucky, but disastrous to his status within the world-wide Irish community.[25] Not only did he repudiate the activities of Young Ireland back in 1848 but also he painted a dark picture of Irish degradation in the United States and added that the reputed American sympathy for Ireland was bogus. Though he urged Irishmen not to emigrate, he did assert that the position of the Irish in British North America was good and specified a number of individuals, including Anglin, who had achieved prominence and influence. Perhaps it was this acknowledgement which caused the *Freeman* to refrain from making extensive commentary on McGee's speech. At the time, it simply concluded that the address had "conclusively settled his proper position as an Irishman . . ."[26] The distinct impression left with the reader was that McGee had 'turned tail' on the traditions and aspirations of the Irish nation. It was, however, a speech in London where McGee attempted to explain away the New Brunswick election that really roused Anglin's ire. The *Freeman* charged McGee with an "unscrupulous" repetition of falsehoods.[27] Anglin's relationship with McGee had obviously ceased being gentlemanly. His attitude to McGee became even more negative as the problem of Fenianism came to the fore.

That issue was a tremendously significant one in the lives of both Irish Catholic leaders and of course, in the death of McGee. Both men suffered severe political setbacks because of Fenianism – McGee losing the support of the Irish Catholic community, at least in Montreal,[28] and Anglin meeting the defeat of his anti-Confederate cause and the loss of his seat in the 1866 New Brunswick election in part because of the skilful use of the Fenian menace by his opponents.[29] Equally, both attempted to salvage some advantage from the issue. McGee used the Fenian scare to promote Confederation and to promote his political acceptability amongst the non-Irish Catholic community.[30] Anglin on the other hand tried to forward his own position as an Irish Catholic leader throughout British North America.

McGee's attitude towards the Fenian Brotherhood, which proposed to liberate Ireland by means of physical force, was completely negative. He denounced the movement totally and vociferously and took every opportunity to ridicule its leaders, organization and composition. He took this stand even before a segment of American Fenians decided late in 1865 that an invasion of the British provinces in North America was the proper

plan of action.[31] Anglin's approach to the Brotherhood was quite different. His attitude could best be characterized as ambivalent, especially prior to the autumn of 1865. While he couldn't get very enthusiastic about a lower-class organization condemned by numerous spokesmen of the Catholic Church, Anglin did not reject Fenianism out of hand. He knew that Irish conditions were deplorable and unjust and therefore approved the goal if not the means proposed by the Fenians. This perspective, coupled with his belief that Fenian strength was tremendously exaggerated, led Anglin to underplay Fenianism for a long time.[32] Undoubtedly no one would have cared much had the Fenians not turned their eyes towards the British provinces. When that occurred the Fenian issue turned from one question of loyalty into another. Until then, it was McGee who had been castigated for his 'disloyalty' to the Irish cause, even by many who doubted the propriety and viability of the Fenian plan. But by October, 1865, it was Anglin who was charged with being 'soft' (or worse) in his attitude towards an organization which threatened armed invasion of the provinces. Neither accusation of disloyalty was more than barely plausible but both men responded to the charges with irritation and aggression. As it turned out, both McGee and Anglin got caught in the other's counter-attack.

McGee's speech in Montreal on November 15, 1865, brought things to a head. McGee had been under fire for his Wexford speech and he used the occasion of a banquet, tendered to him by his political associates, to defend his views. He reinterated his comments about the degradation of many Irish in the United States, though he took care to claim that he had not ignored the praiseworthy Irish in that country. He mocked and berated the Fenians at some length and denied that the Canadian Irish were disloyal and tainted with Fenianism except perhaps for a few "fools." His speech continued with a listing of the wrongs suffered by Ireland and a call for their rectification, things that had been conspicuously absent from his comments at Wexford.[33] Anglin too was on the defensive in mid-November, for the New Brunswick pro-Confederates had just won the important York by-election on the strength of an anti-Anglin, anti-Fenian campaign. Thus the *Freeman* used McGee's speech, on the one hand to refute the charge of a Fenian force existing in British North America, and on the other hand to castigate McGee for "insults" to the American Irish uttered in Wexford, London and Montreal. Anglin charged McGee with wantonly "depicting the very worst type of the worst class . . . as the true representative of the great mass of the Irish Americans . . . " in return for the plaudits of the British elite.

> Deliberately, wilfully, with malice prepense and aforethought, to serve his own ends, he calumniated the whole Irish population of the United States, and now with an air of sweetest innocence, much injured, he pretends that he attacked only the Fenians.

The *Freeman* asserted that McGee's attack on Fenianism in Montreal was simply an attempt to raise a bogeyman to cover his slander of Irishmen and the fact that he was under censure by a good many of his Irish constituents.[34]

Anglin's attack on McGee had undoubtedly been triggered by the accusations of Confederates that Anglin was associated with Fenianism and that as Anglin was a leading supporter of the existing New Brunswick Government, the Antis were disloyal and ought to be overthrown. The same sort of charges continued throughout the rest of 1865 and on into 1866. In April, 1866, a curious and ineffective Fenian raid on New Brunswick coincided with the pressured resignation of the Anti Government and during the ensuing election Anglin's name was bandied about quite freely, usually in connection with the Fenian threat. The result of the contest was, of course, overwhelming victory for Tilley's Confederates. Anglin's anger and frustration at these developments found a target in D'Arcy McGee among others. The *Freeman* claimed that the Fenian activity made no sense on the face of it. They hung around the border making lots of noise, attracting much attention and issuing proclamations urging New Brunswickers not to join Confederation. They were led by a man named Killian who was a prominent member of the branch of the Fenians which had repudiated the concept of invading the British colonies.[35] Anglin maintained that no genuine raiding party would have talked so loudly or taken so long to attack. He also believed that Killian's proclamation against Confederation could only hurt the anti-Confederate cause. To this point Anglin's analysis was correct. But rather than concluding that the Fenian raiders were a pack of adventurers attempting to win support in their contest with the other branch of American Fenianism, he adopted the conspiracy theory that the Confederates, particularly McGee, must be behind the raid. McGee's acquaintance with the Fenian Society was considerable (indeed Killian had once worked for McGee[36]) and McGee had indicated in his Wexford speech he had seen letters from Fenians offering to betray their brethren. There were always accusations in the air about spies within the Brotherhood and charges that Fenian leaders misappropriated funds. Then too, a letter purporting to be written by McGee to Killian in a friendly tone, though denounced as a forgery, was published in the Toronto *Globe* on March 3, 1866.[37] Given all these things as well as the obvious fact that the Fenian agitation would aid the Confederate cause, Anglin allowed his suspicions to run away with him. Surely, Anglin concluded, McGee had both the motive and opportunity to promote the Fenian raid on New Brunswick.[38]

McGee did not let Anglin away with these insinuations and accusations. He wrote an angry letter demanding that Anglin prove or retract three

specific points which had been raised: 1) that he (McGee) and Killian had been business partners; 2) the suspicion that they were still working together; and 3) that McGee fled to America with a price on his head in 1848. With no little bravado he concluded:

> Stand forth then, Mr. Anglin, and make good your words or eat them, or else stand convicted of slandering an absent man, for the sake of promoting your anti-union ends and purposes.[39]

The real if not the literal truth of the first and third charges were easily proven but on the second point Anglin had a good deal more difficulty. His proof here was notable by its absence:

> Mr. Killian's mission to Eastport rendered great services to the cause of Confederation, of which Mr. McGee is a prominent advocate. So far, whether by previous agreement or not, they worked together.[40]

In the days that followed, the controversy continued heatedly with the *Freeman* becoming almost slanderous;

> . . . he [McGee] became a politician without principle, willing to sell his talents to any party that chose to purchase, and trading in the influence which his eloquence and his previous history gave him amongst the Irishmen of Canada.[41]

The controversy over loyalty and Fenianism had thus brought about a total and irrevocable hostility between the two Irish Catholic leaders. On the one hand it was clear that on the issue of Confederation at least, McGee had emerged victorious over Anglin. But on the other hand, while McGee was gaining some satisfaction from the achievement of Confederation, Anglin seemed to be moving toward replacing McGee as the major spokesman for the Irish Catholic community in the new Dominion of Canada. The contest promised to be hard fought and to provide some entertainment, or at least so the Saint John *News* thought:

> . . . it will be pleasant by and by to watch the meeting of Mr. McGee and Mr. Anglin on the floors of the Parliament Chamber. It will be an agreeable pastime, now and then, to see the Hon. little McGee intellectually spin round the Hon. large Anglin on his head, with his feet pointing toward the zenith.[42]

In the competition with Anglin, McGee had some weaknesses balancing the prestige gained from the achievement of Confederation. In the first place the division of the Province of Canada into two provinces in 1867 rendered less consequential his Ontarian support when he was seeking election in Montreal.[43] Undoubtedly this had something to do with McGee not receiving

a position in the first Dominion cabinet, a fact which in itself contributed further to the diminution of McGee's political stature.[44] Underlying this decline was the fact that McGee was losing his grip on the Montreal Irish community which had always been the backbone of his political power. By the 1867 election McGee was in considerable political difficulty.

> It was the first time McGee had run in a general election as a Liberal-Conservative, and it was interpreted as his going over to the other side. His change to the "Tories" closely paralleled his opposition to the Fenians, his statements on behalf of the British connection, and his acquisition of a new home that had been purchased ostensibly by public conscription, but actually by the business community, particularly John Molson. These facts . . . all lent themselves to the notion that McGee had sold out.[45]

Bernard Devlin, the President of the St. Patrick's Society of Montreal, became his opponent on the hustings. McGee faced hostile Irish crowds during the campaign and although he won the election, he failed to carry Griffintown for the first time in his life.[46]

With McGee's difficulties Anglin had no sympathy. While it is undeniable that he exploited the situation for his own benefit, it was not simply a matter of self-aggrandizement, for Anglin did believe that as an Irish Catholic leader McGee was doing great harm. He felt that McGee was berating those he was supposed to lead and slandering his own countrymen,

> sometimes by admitting with mock reluctance that they were almost as bad as their worst enemies described them; sometimes by impertinently advising them with an air of the greatest imaginable kindness and solicitude not unmixed with a large share of condescension not to do something or other which only their most bitter enemies ever imagined them capable of doing.[47]

Nor did the *Freeman* credit McGee with preventing the spread of Fenianism, as some were claiming. It declared:

> We believe that Mr. McGee did absolutely nothing to prevent the spread of Fenianism in Canada, because his language on that subject, uttered to please his patrons, was always calculated to irritate and provoke rather than to persuade. If Fenianism made little way amongst Irishmen in Canada it was we believe because their own good sense and their own knowledge of the duty they owed to the country of their adoption stood in the way . . .[48]

Indeed, Anglin considered that by the summer of 1867 McGee was simply using a cry of Fenianism to imply that "the disgust and contempt of him

which honest Irishmen everywhere now feel", was caused by Fenianism.[49] Thus to Anglin's mind there was little good to counterbalance the bad that McGee was producing and so the *Freeman* pressed the thesis that McGee could no longer speak as the voice of the Irish Catholic community even in Montreal, let alone outside that constituency. It concluded:

> . . . the wonder is that the man who made that Wexford speech, and so many other speeches of the same kind, can find even half a dozen Irishmen, so devoid of all spirit and manly feeling as to vote for him.[50]

It is not surprising that Anglin took great interest in the Montreal election of 1867. For one thing he had tacitly conceded to McGee on the union question and had decided to give Confederation a try and to seek a House of Commons seat himself.[51] Matters relating to the Irish Catholic community throughout the entire Dominion suddenly took on even greater relevance for Anglin and his *Freeman*. This was undoubtedly one of the factors impelling Anglin to undertake a lengthy rebuttal to the letter of Archbishop Connolly of Halifax in support of McGee's election in 1867. The portrait Anglin sketched of McGee's Canadian career was hardly complimentary even though Anglin recognized that McGee was beyond question "a man of great abilities and rare eloquence . . . " But these talents, the *Freeman* asserted, had been prostituted. Lacking any political principle except "selling his services and his countrymen to the highest bidder", McGee had turned from being "the trusted representative of the Irish in Canada" to courting the English and Scotch Protestants by "systematically decrying and defaming his own countrymen . . . " The final blow to McGee's prestige with Irishmen had been utterances such as those at Wexford:

> . . . they could not bear to discover day by day fresh proofs that if any love for Ireland had ever really lived in him it had been killed by the most miserable selfishness, and that even while still pretending to be their champion, he was meanly pandering to the worst prejudices and the most besotted bigotry of the worst of his new friends at the expense of all that Irishmen hold most dear.[52]

Thus although Anglin disapproved of the shouting down of McGee on the hustings, he understood the hostility of Irishmen towards their 'representative'.[53] The fact that McGee won one of the Montreal seats did not unduly disturb Anglin's perspective for he claimed that the Irish votes McGee received could be accounted for by Grand Trunk influence and by a reaction to "the insane violence of some of Devlin's pretended friends . . . " The *Freeman* considered that the election had brought McGee down to his proper level, for not only had he failed to carry the Irish section of Montreal

but also he had lost in Prescott, the second constituency he contested. For the *Freeman*, the conclusion was clear:

> It is of little consequence that Mr. McGee has been elected, for, as he now stands, no man in the Legislature will be less influential for good and evil than he; but it is of great importance that the Irishmen of Montreal and of Upper Canada have demonstrated to all parties that he is no longer a representative of theirs, or authorized to speak on their behalf, or to make any pretensions to be their prophet and guide.[54]

An indication that many Irishmen agreed with Anglin came in the middle of October when Anglin, along with Joseph Howe and Patrick Power of Nova Scotia, received invitations from the St. Patrick's Society of Montreal to attend its annual concert. This was no accident. The Society had rejected McGee's leadership and under the presidency of Devlin had obviously decided to direct its political support to Anglin and other opposition M.P.'s. Normally held in January, the concert had even been specially scheduled to suit the convenience of the invited guests who would be travelling to Ottawa early in November.[55] Not unnaturally the Society expected more from their guests than their mere presence, although Anglin claimed to be unprepared to speak and seemed very halting and apologetic at the beginning of his address.[56] But as he went along what may have been mere nervousness disappeared and he warmed up to the gathering. He told the audience about his political stance – no fixed party position but willing to give Confederation his best efforts. Then he told them something about the Irish Catholic community of New Brunswick; their trials and tribulations; the prejudices with which they were faced; and the way in which he believed these ought to be overcome. He went on to say that,

> The only way to meet this opposition is to live it down - - to do what is right and leave it to time to satisfy the honest portion of our fellow-citizens that we are not what they believe and represent us to be, but that we are sincerely desirous to prove ourselves, in every private and public act, to be good citizens and subjects.

By this time Anglin was working on all cylinders and he proceeded to make what might be termed a political manifesto to the Irish Catholics of the new Dominion. It was not by hiding the fact that they were Irish that they would advance. They ought not to be ashamed of the old country nor its history. It would be by living as Irishmen ought to live that they would win the confidence of the rest of the people. Anglin pointed out that it was the Irish who did much of the work – a great deal of the hard work – which was promoting the economic growth of the country. He exhorted his fellows not

to look outside for help; the Irish would have to build themselves up. If they failed to rise to a position equal to others it would be their own fault. The Irish must prove they were worthy. Anglin assured his audience that the task would not be an easy one.

> There never was a time in the history of the Irish people when their position was one of such exceeding difficulty as it is at the present moment. We are charged with being disloyal - - with being traitors to our country. It is said we cannot be trusted, and though we enjoy the protection of this country and eat of its bread we are traitors at heart. You know that is a vile calumny - - a lie. We know what we owe to the country . . . It is our duty to do what is right, and let us make up our minds to do it, and then we will receive the applause of the wise and good. We know the Government of this country is the most benign and just that ever existed, and we know that we owe to this Government unbounded and unqualified allegiance. We should therefore do our duty to our country, our fellow-citizens, and our families, and then take what comes as a matter of course.

It was a rather impressive speech. It invoked the better instincts of his Irish listeners. It was fully in line with the speaker's practice of attempting to 'improve' the Irish while fighting for their rights. It was also an indication that Anglin would not hesitate to contest even on McGee's old stamping-grounds the leadership of the Irish Catholic community, and it wasn't long before the Anglo-Catholic newspapers friendly to McGee began to turn their fire towards Anglin.[57]

In the Commons itself, Anglin was not anxious to take a prominent role before becoming thoroughly acquainted with procedures in the House.[58] McGee did not allow him this luxury. The throne speech debate, dominated by Nova Scotians, had nearly come to an end by November 14, 1867. Early that evening, however, McGee had risen in the House and in a speech which even Anglin admitted contained "some beautiful passages", reviewed the situation in Nova Scotia at length, proceeded thence to New Brunswick in the course of which he attacked Anglin, though not by name, and concluded by making charges of Fenianism against a portion of the Montreal Irish.[59] He claimed among other things, that at the concert which Howe and Anglin had attended in Montreal ten days before, the St. Patrick's Society had honoured the names of several Fenian leaders.[60] The speech forced Anglin to his feet where he remained for an hour and a half answering McGee.[61] He dealt at length with the "vile and infamous means" by which the Confederates had succeeded in New Brunswick. He spoke of many other things as well, but perhaps most important was his defence of the Irish of New Brunswick and Montreal "from the calumnies first insinuated and afterwards openly hurled at them by the member for Montreal West". The speech, at least according to

one source friendly to Anglin, created a considerable sensation and made the Government unhappy with McGee, for Anglin's counter-attack had produced a "stronger anti-Confederate sentiment than anything yet said".[62] In the first clash of the two Irish Catholics on the floor of the Commons Anglin had given as good as he had received. He might even claim a victory:

> It might not be amiss to state that Mr. McGee, although the assailant, left the House some time after Mr. Anglin began his reply to him, and some were malicious enough to say he ran away.[63]

The St. Patrick's Society of Montreal approved of Anglin's defence of the Irishmen of that city and passed a motion expressing its appreciation.[64] It then proceeded to expel McGee from membership in the organization, an action which Anglin felt compelled to explain to the press of New Brunswick. He stated that:

> It is because he [McGee] has . . . become the slanderer of his own race and people, and because he has so persistently calumniated the members of the St. Patrick's Society, that he has at length been expelled.[65]

The association of Anglin with the Montreal Irish was continued on St. Patrick's Day, 1868. Once again the St. Patrick's Society invited Anglin to be its guest and once again Anglin spoke words which met with the enthusiastic approval of his audience. As befitted the occasion he emphasized the history and traditions of the homeland and boasted that in spite of their trials, Irishmen had proved throughout the world that they "cannot be subdued or exterminated". Nor could he agree that Ireland's problems had been solved or were likely to be alleviated quickly:

> . . . he would ask the vast audience of over three thousand assembled, if they were content with the condition of their countrymen? (Loud cries of "No", "No", from every part of the hall answered the question). Mr. Anglin said he trusted that emphatic reply would go across the Atlantic . . . he considered the Irish would have to struggle a long time before changes could be made, so that the country will become what it ought to be.

Anglin went on to suggest that British politicians apply the Canadian model of responsible government to Ireland and concluded by urging "all Irishmen to elevate themselves in the moral, social and intellectual scale . . . "[66]

At this juncture it was apparent that Anglin was threatening to attain complete dominance in his contest with McGee. The New Brunswick Irishman had turned the tables on McGee and was taking issue with McGee on

his home grounds just as McGee had interfered politically with Anglin in 1863-64. Of course not all Irishmen approved of Anglin's activity. The *Canadian Freeman*, for example, denounced his involvement and aggravation of the split within the Montreal Irish community.[67] But other newspaper organs of English-language Catholics, from the very conservative Montreal *True Witness* to the rabid Irish nationalist paper, the Toronto *Irish Canadian*, spoke favourably of the newcomer to Canadian politics.[68] What the outcome of the struggle between McGee and Anglin might have been is doubtful. There were some indications that McGee might retire from politics, or perhaps might attempt to establish a base of political power in Ottawa. Certainly the extraordinary natural abilities and eloquence of the man would always have given him a significant following as long as he chose to stay in politics. It is entirely possible that McGee might have been able to work his way back into favour with the Irish community and this may have been a factor in two appeals he made for redress of Irish grievances in March and April of 1868.[69] But, of course, the contest was not carried to its natural conclusion, for McGee was assassinated on April 7, 1868.

Anglin and McGee did not agree on very many things by 1868. But curiously enough it was on one of these rare notes of harmony that their volatile relationship ended. On April 3, Macdonald had proposed in the House that a section of the oath of allegiance for members of parliament which was obnoxious to Catholics be struck out. First McGee expressed his gratification. Anglin followed with similar sentiments.[70] Four days later McGee was dead.

The assassination of McGee placed Anglin in an incredibly difficult position. He had been making very harsh criticisms of the man who now lay dead. The criticisms had been made seriously. Anglin believed that McGee had been wrong in his whole approach and in his accusations. Anglin could not retract these honest beliefs. But there seemed to be little doubt that one or more Fenians had been responsible for the foul deed. Understandably, then, Anglin was rather reticent to talk or write about McGee personally. He tended to concentrate on other details of the tragedy, but there was no doubt about his horror, as his report to the *Freeman* showed:

> . . . everywhere the blood of honest men runs cold as they hear of this most deliberate and most atrocious murder . . . As is well known Mr. cold-blooded assassin . . . now the brain teeming with thought, richly stored with learning, and quickened with a genius rarely surpassed, is at rest, and the tongue, so eloquent is silenced forever."

In the Commons Anglin was brief in speaking on behalf of the Irish of New Brunswick and the Dominion. He acknowledged his embarrassment at the

fact that the deed was undoubtedly the work of an organization of Irishmen, however not, he trusted, of Irishmen belonging to the Dominion. He concluded that:

> It is an outrage that will probably have a great effect on the future of this country. None of us can realize its effects yet. The shock is too recent, and some of us can on this occasion give vent to the feelings which overmaster us. Perhaps, after all, this is the highest tribute which we can pay to the man who has gone from amongst us.[72]

Undoubtedly Anglin must have prayed that it had been none of his words of denunciation of McGee that had triggered the deranged mind of the assassin. Perhaps he even began to question whether he ought to have been so sanguine about the contentedness and stability of the Canadian Irish. With McGee's death the entire Irish Catholic community came into disrepute and Anglin, naturally enough, was accused of playing fast and loose with Fenianism.[73] But even in these days Anglin betrayed neither his principles nor the Irish community he led. He was one of the courageous few who questioned the treatment Whelan, the accused murderer, received in the name of justice.[74]

Nevertheless, the death of McGee was a blow to Anglin's political aspirations. While McGee was alive Anglin had an unquestionably able opponent. Had he lived it seems probable that McGee would have been a foil by which Anglin might have risen to much greater heights than he did. There were good indications that Irish Catholics throughout the Dominion were beginning to look upon Anglin with favour while McGee was in growing disrepute. With McGee's death this situation changed. The Irish community was now in disgrace and being its leader was no asset. Moreover, Irish Catholics seemed to react to McGee's death by withdrawing from politics and for several years thereafter there were few occasions on which they became involved in national politics as a distinct group.[75] Then too, members of the St. Patrick's Society of Montreal had acclaimed Anglin because he opposed McGee. With McGee gone, so was their rationale for supporting Anglin. For all Irish Catholic Canadians McGee's death was a tragedy. As long as the organism on the spit was still squirming there was a good deal of applause for the exhibition and the chef. As soon as the victim was dead, however, those who had applauded and assisted in roasting the body were castigated as cruel torturers. And so, the supreme irony of the whole affair was that in death McGee finally succeeded in skewering his opponents, leaving them to writhe for years to come.

Emerging from an analysis of the McGee-Anglin dispute are several matters of relevance to the study of Canadian history. Aside from the obvious fact that rivals in the 1860's were hardly reticent to voice personal

animosities in public, it is also quite apparent that the Irish Catholic community in the Dominion was far from united in its approach to politics. This is of significance when one considers the assumption made too frequently of the bloc politics adopted by Irish Catholics. The Anglin – McGee confrontation also demonstrated the problem presented to Irish Canadians when the question of the homeland came to the fore. On the one hand Irish Catholics did seem reasonably content in Canada and were loyal to the governmental system and to the imperial connection. But most Irish Catholics resident in Canada were also very unhappy with the operation of the British system in Ireland and desired the restoration of self-government to the Emerald Isle. Thus Irish Canadians seemed to compartmentalize their attitudes towards Great Britain: for Canada, the imperial tie was good and useful; for Ireland, the British connection was highly deleterious. The difficulty of this stance was the virtual impossibility of explaining it to outsiders. How could the American Irish, for example, understand the favour with which D'Arcy McGee and other Irish Canadians looked upon the system of British constitutional monarchy and their desire to retain the tie with Great Britain? Conversely, how could Anglo-Canadians comprehend that Irish Canadians might be willing to condone even the use of force against Britain in an effort to free Ireland, and yet be content and loyal to that same British crown within the Canadian context? It was not an easy thing even for Irish Canadians to understand their attitudes towards Britain. Therefore it was extremely difficult for their leaders to articulate this position without falling too much on one side, as seen, for example, in McGee's speeches at Wexford and London in 1865.

The problem of the British tie is merely a good example of the general difficulty faced by the Irish Catholic community in becoming acculturized in Canada. Most of them had left Ireland by necessity rather than by choice and many retained a strong affection for the old country. It is conceivable that with its heritage and perspective the Irish Catholic community could have been a tremendously disruptive element in the functioning of Canadian society. To some extent it was, but the fact that it was not more so must be attributed to elements of the Irish mentality which are frequently overlooked, particularly its conservatism, and to the leadership provided by men like McGee and Anglin.[76] Despite the hostility evident between the two men, it is not unrealistic to suggest that their ultimate goals for Irish Catholics were virtually identical. Both men preached loyalty to the legally constituted system, in Canada at least, and advocated non-violent methods for reform. Both men desired to retain the Catholicism of Irish Catholics but had little ultimate concern about their Irishness. In essence both leaders argued for Irish integration into the wider community. Neither demanded that Irish

Catholics retain a group consciousness in order to ward off assimilation, for both McGee and Anglin considered that distinctiveness promoted continued discrimination and inferiority. This conception lay behind not only McGee's advocacy of the "new nationality" but also the sentiments expressed by Anglin in Montreal in 1867. Both men also agreed that the acculturation process would be a lengthy one, that Irish Catholics had to receive fair play along the pathway, and that until the end of the road had been reached the Irish Catholic community would need leadership.[77] Irish Catholic leaders, therefore, had a delicate balancing act to perform. They had to promote harmony and integration of the Irish with the rest of Canadian society while standing up for Irish rights and defending the Irish against harmful allegations. As well, there was a final and very important factor involved. The leader could not proceed too rapidly along the road or he would lose his following. Throughout their respective careers Anglin and McGee both attempted to operate according to these precepts. Anglin's activity between 1863 and 1868 certainly seems to demonstrate his skill at practicing the politics of 'balance'. While he alienated some highly-placed Catholic clerics and probably helped to promote disunity amongst the Irish populace in Montreal, he did seem to be in touch with the thinking of the mass of Irish-Catholic Canadians and to be a credible spokesman for their interests. McGee was not as successful. In spite of the fact that he considered that he was defending Irish Canadians in decrying Fenianism, McGee seems to have been moving along the road too rapidly for his followers. Many of them did not appreciate his form of defence which included, evidently, the denial of the liberation effort of 1848 and the castigation of Irish Americans. Many could not accept McGee's apparent repudiation of his Irish heritage and felt that his adoption of an intense Canadian nationalism prevented him from being an adequate spokesman for Irish Catholic interests. After all, McGee himself had recognized in 1857 the validity of a 'haste makes waste' argument.

> Where there is diversity in the origin, time only can play the part of solvent. Such a result ["a unification of population"] cannot be hurried without being delayed . . .[78]

Even so it is not unlikely that McGee could have worked himself back into favour with the segment of the Irish community he had alienated. His re-emphasis of the grievances of Ireland in the spring of 1868 certainly augured well for this development. Whether McGee really desired to modify his opinions sufficiently to allow disgruntled Irish Catholics to accept his leadership or whether he had reached the end of the acculturation road himself and had no desire to go back and help the stragglers must remain unanswered.

Nevertheless, one must reiterate that the general policy and goals of McGee and Anglin for the Irish community were very similar. They disputed the method to be followed to achieve the ends desired by both, but it is surely significant that the two most prominent Irish Catholic politicians in British North America in the 1860's agreed upon supporting the legally–established constitution and upon the desirability of the ultimate absorption of the Irish Catholic community into the larger society. Without that, and the fact that the majority of Canadian Irish Catholics accepted that direction, the course of Canada's history might have been very different.

NOTES

[1] Timothy Warren Anglin (1822-1896) was born and educated in Clonakilty, County Cork. He emigrated to Saint John, New Brunswick in 1849 and founded the *Freeman* which remained under his editorship until 1883. He was elected to the New Brunswick Assembly as a member for Saint John County in 1861, opposed Confederation and became a member of the anti-Confederate Government formed after the 1865 election. He resigned his post in November, 1865, over a disagreement about the Government's railway policy and was defeated in the election of 1866. In 1867 he was elected to the House of Commons for the constituency of Gloucester and held that seat until the 1882 election. He was Speaker of the Commons during the Mackenzie administration (1874-78). In 1883 he moved to Toronto and took over the Toronto *Tribune* and became an editorial contributor to the Toronto *Globe*. During 1887 he lost both positions and for the next decade he was able to find only part-time work on various commissions.

[2] Thomas D'Arcy McGee (1825-1868) was born at Carlingford, County Louth and educated in Wexford. In 1842 he emigrated to the United States and was taken on by the Boston *Pilot* as an editor. He followed this vocation on his return to Ireland in 1845, eventually attaching himself to the 'Young Ireland' paper, the *Nation*. He was involved, though not in actual fighting, in the 1848 rebellion and fled to the United States where he struggled to maintain a newspaper, initially in New York, then in Boston and finally in Buffalo. In 1857 a group of Montreal Irishmen imported him and helped him establish the *New Era*. He was elected to the Legislative Assembly in 1858 and maintained his seat until his death in 1868. The story of his political career in Canada is so well-known that it does not require elaboration here.

[3] *Morning Freeman* (Saint John), June 26, 1866.

[4] Anglin's calm response to name-calling from Attorney General John M. Johnson in the 1864 session of the New Brunswick Assembly moved one assemblyman to comment, "Who would have thought that an Irishman would stand so much and not show fight" (see *Freeman*, March 8, 1864; and *Daily Evening Globe* (Saint John), March 4, 1864). In contrast, McGee was often theatrically flamboyant and spontaneous (see, for example, H.J. O'C. Clarke, *A Short Sketch of the Life of the Hon. Thomas D'Arcy McGee,* (Montreal, 1868), p.9]. Indications of McGee's political philosophy can be found in McGee, "The Present and Past Attempts to Establish the Reformation in Ireland", Oct. 17, 1853, pp. 10-11 of typescript copy in Public Archives of Canada (P.A.C.), John J. O'Gorman Papers; McGee, "Letter to Daniel Macarow", June 12, 1863, quoted in R. B. Burns, "D'Arcy McGee and the New Nationality", (unpublished Master's thesis, Carleton University, 1966), p. 4; McGee, "A Plea for British American Nationality", 1863, in R. B. Burns, "D'Arcy McGee: A Father of Confederation", *Documentary*

Problems in Canadian History, Vol. I: *Pre-Confederation*, ed. J.M. Bumsted, (Georgetown, Ontario, 1969), p. 268; McGee, *Speeches and Addresses: Chiefly on the Subject of British American Union*, (London, 1865), p. 129; and McGee, "The New Nation and the Old Empire", Feb. 28, 1868, reported in *Evening Express and Commercial Record*, (Halifax), March 9, 1868. Anglin's ideology can be glimpsed in *Freeman*, July 3, 1856, quoted in *Morning News* (Saint John), July 4, 1856; *Freeman*, Jan. 6, 1859; Dec. 4, 1860; July 12, 1862; and Aug. 5, 1875.

5 W. M. Baker, "No Shillelagh: The Life, Journalism and Politics of Timothy Warren Anglin" (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Western Ontario, 1972), pp.1-2 and 7-8; T.P. Slattery, *The Assassination of D'Arcy McGee*, (Toronto, 1968), pp. 4-5.

6 An analysis of McGee's views on Catholicism is found in O'Gorman Papers, "McGee the Catholic Lay Apostle". Two examples of Anglin's attitude towards religious influences guiding a man's life are located in *Freeman*, July 12, 1862; and March 16, 1869. McGee's assertion that the Irish rebellion of 1848 had failed because of priestly indifference or opposition involved him in controversy with Bishop John Hughes of New York in 1848-49 (see Slattery, *op. cit.*, p. 27). Anglin and Bishop James Rogers disagreed publicly and rather bitterly during the 1866 New Brunswick election (see Baker, *op. cit.*, p. 269).

7 Baker, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

8 A detailed report of this speech was printed in the *Freeman*, July 30, 1863. The lecture was also printed in McGee, *Speeches and Addresses*, pp. 68-82.

9 On the change in McGee's views of the United States see J. G. Snell, "Thomas D'Arcy McGee and the American Republic", *Canadian Review of American Studies*, III, No. 1 (Spring, 1972), pp. 33-44.

10 It is interesting to note that J. H. Gray and S. L. Tilley, leaders of the pro-Intercolonial Railway forces and political opponents of Anglin, were the two men who thanked McGee at the conclusion of the lecture.

11 Baker, *op. cit.*, pp. 126-132.

12 *Freeman*, Aug. 3, 1863.

13 *IBID.*, Aug. 1, 1863.

14 *IBID.*, Aug. 8, 1863.

15 *IBID.*, Aug. 13, 1863.

16 *IBID*

17 *IBID*

18 *IBID.*, Aug. 15, 1863.

19 *IBID.*, Nov. 22, 1860.

20 *IBID.*, Aug. 15, 1863.

21 *IBID.*, Aug. 13, 1863.

22 *IBID.*, Aug. 15, 1863.

23 Quoted in D.G. Creighton, *John A. Macdonald*, Vol. 1: *The Young Politician*, (Toronto, 1952), p. 407.

24 *Freeman*, Oct. 10, 1865.

25 See, for example, C.G. Duffy, *Four Years of Irish History 1845-1849*, (London, 1883), p.776. The response of the *Irish Canadian* (Toronto) to McGee's speech was exceptionally harsh (see *Irish Canadian*, June 7, and 14, 1865). The report of McGee's address which appeared in the Dublin *Evening Mail*, n.d., was reprinted in the *Irish Canadian*, June 7, 1865, and is also available in P.A.C., Hon. Charles Murphy Papers. On June 14 the *Irish Canadian* related the claim of the *Wexford People* that the *Mail's* report contained "whole passages that were not spoken *at all* in Wexford".

26 *Freeman*, July 11, 1865.

27 *IBID.*

28 H. Senior, "Quebec and the Fenians", *Canadian Historical Review (C.H.R.)*, XLVIII, 1967, p.39.

29 W.M. Baker, "Squelching the Disloyal Fenian – Sympathizing Brood: T.W. Anglin and Confederation in New Brunswick, 1865-66", *C.H.R.*, LV, 1974, pp.141-158.

30 Burns, "McGee and the New Nationality", pp. 74-75.

31 McGee, *Speeches and Addresses*, pp. 141-48 (the speech, entitled "The Irish in Canada; The Importation of Fenianism", Jan. 11, 1865, is also available in typescript in the O'Gorman Papers). See also the report of the Wexford address. R.B. Burns has dealt with McGee and Fenianism in "D'Arcy McGee and the Fenians: A Study of the Interaction Between Irish Nationalism and the American Environment", *University Review* (Dublin), 1967, pp. 260-273.

32 Baker, "No Shillelagh", pp. 220-22.

33 McGee, "McGee's Speech at McGee Banquet", Nov. 15, 1865, typescript copy in O'Gorman Papers.

34 *Freeman*, Nov. 25, 1865.

35 H.A. Davis, "The Fenian Raid on New Brunswick", *C.H.R.*, XXXVI, 1955, pp. 316-334.

36 Slattery, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

37 Reprinted in *Canadian Freeman*, March 8, 1866.

38 *Morning Freeman* (Saint John), Apr. 21 and May 3, 1866.

39 McGee to Anglin, June 1, 1866, in *News*, June 8, 1866, quoted in *Freeman*, June 12, 1866.

40 *Freeman*, June 12, 1866. On the first charge see also *ibid.*, June 16, 1866. In support of the third charge Anglin claimed that McGee had escaped from Ireland disguised as a Catholic priest. His source of information had been McGee's own statement made on one occasion in Saint John. See also Slattery, *op. cit.*, p. 34 and p. 330.

41 *Freeman*, June 26, 1866.

42 *News*, March 11, 1867, quoted in *Freeman*, March 12, 1867.

43 Burns, "McGee and the New Nationality", p. 57.

44 Slattery, *op. cit.*, pp. 382-391.

45 Burns, *op. cit.*, pp. 57-58.

46 *IBID*; and Senior, "Quebec and the Fenians", pp. 37-39.

47 *Freeman*, Aug. 6, 1867.

48 *IBID.*

49 *IBID.*, Aug. 27, 1867.

50 *IBID.*, Aug. 3, 1867.

51 Anglin's position in 1867, undoubtedly coloured by political expediency, was that Confederation was now law, that New Brunswick had ceased to be a significant entity (the *Freeman* published a death notice for New Brunswick on June 15, 1867), and that one might as well make the best of a bad thing.

52 *Freeman*, Aug. 6, 1867. The Archbishop's letter to H.J. Clarke, July 22, 1867, was printed in the *Gazette* (Montreal), Aug. 1, 1867.

53 *Freeman*, Aug. 10, 1867.

54 *IBID.*, Sept. 10, 1867.

55 P.A.C., Joseph Howe Papers, Wm. B. Lenihan to Howe, Oct. 10, 1867.

56 The speech was reported in the *Freeman*, Nov. 12, 1867.

57 *Express*, Nov. 13 and Nov. 27, 1867; and *Canadian Freeman*, Nov. 28 and Dec. 12, 1867. The *Canadian Freeman*, Dec. 26, 1867, printed an interesting letter from "Sarsfield" defending Anglin.

58 *Globe*, n.d., quoted in *Morning Freeman*, Jan. 4, 1868.

59 "T.W.A.", Nov. 15, 1867, in *Freeman*, Nov. 21, 1867. "T.W.A." was, of course, Timothy Warren Anglin.

60 Slattery, *op. cit.*, p. 429; and D.C. Lyne, "The Irish in the Province of Canada in the Decade Leading up to Confederation" (unpublished Master's thesis, McGill University, 1960), pp. 260-61. On February 11, 1868, the *Freeman* claimed that the names of many prominent Irishmen were painted on plaques attached to the wall and had been hanging there for years before McGee decided to single out a couple to support his charge of Fenianism. McGee had, of course, been a prominent member of the Society for all those years.

61 The speech is reported in "T.W.A.", Nov. 15, 1867, in *Freeman*, Nov. 21, 1867. See also Slattery, *op. cit.*, p. 429; and J. Young, *Public Men and Public Life in Canada*, (Toronto, 1912), II, p.44.

62 *Globe*, Nov. 15, 1867, quoted in *Freeman*, Nov. 16, 1867.

63 "T.W.A.", Nov. 15, 1867, in *Freeman*, Nov. 21, 1867

64 Slattery, *op cit.*, p. 429.

65 *Freeman*, Feb. 6, 1868. On the issue of the expulsion of McGee from the St. Patrick's Society see Slattery, *op. cit.*, pp. 434-36.

66 *Gazette*, March 18, 1868.

67 *Canadian Freeman*, Jan. 2, 1868.

68 *True Witness*, March 13, 1868; and *Irish Canadian*, Jan. 1 and March 25, 1868.

69 The first appeal was made during his St. Patrick's Day speech in Ottawa (see O'Gorman Papers, "Thomas D'Arcy McGee: The Irishman – The Canadian – The Catholic", pp. 20-21). The second was a letter written to Lord Mayo on April 5th, 1868 (see *ibid.*, pp. 23-25).

70 "T.W.A.", Apr. 4, 1868, in *Freeman*, Apr. 11, 1868.

71 "T.W.A.", Apr. 7, 1868, in *Freeman*, Apr. 14, 1868.

72 *Canada: House of Commons, Debates, 1867-8*, ed. P.B. Waite, (Ottawa, 1967), pp. 479-480.

73 *Canadian Freeman*, Apr. 30, 1868; and *Express*, May 1, 1868.

74 "T.W.A.", Apr. 15, 1868, in *Morning Freeman*, Apr. 21, 1868; and "T.W.A.", Apr. 16, 1868, in *Freeman*, Apr. 23, 1868.

75 Even the 1870 Fenian raids seemed to bring forward a similar response from the Irish as from the rest of Canadian society. The *Freeman*, for example, denounced the raids as a "mad and wicked enterprise" (see *Freeman*, May 31, 1870).

76 "Elite accommodation" has long been a feature of the operation of Canadian politics and has recently received theoretical formulation and practical application by Canadian political scientists (see, for example, S.J.R. Noel, "Consociational Democracy and Canadian Federalism", *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, IV, 1971, pp. 15-18; and R. Presthus, *Elite Accommodation in Canadian Politics*, (Toronto, 1973).)

77 Indications of McGee's views of the desirable future of Canadian Irish Catholics and his conception of the role of an Irish Catholic leader can be seen in the *New Era*, May 25 and 29, Sept. 12 and Nov. 7, 1857; McGee to A.A. Dorion, Jan. 14, 1863, quoted in O'Gorman Papers, "McGee the Catholic Lay Apostle", p. 8n; McGee, *Speeches and Addresses*, p. 112; R.D. McGibbon, *Thomas D'Arcy McGee*, (Montreal, 1884), p. 10; and Burns, "McGee and the New Nationality", pp. 79-80. Anglin's perspective is presented in Baker, "No Shillelagh", *passim*.

78 *New Era*, May 29, 1857.